1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
2	SOUTHERN DIVISION
3	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
5	Plaintiff, DOCKET NO. 1:19-cr-25
6	vs.
7	MUSE ABDIKADIR MUSE,
8	MOHAMED SALAT HAJI, and MOHAMUD ABDIKADIR MUSE,
9	
10	Defendants.
11	/
12	
13	TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE
14	BEFORE THE HONORABLE GORDON J. QUIST
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16	GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN
17	December 10, 2019
18	
19	Court Reporter: Glenda Trexler
20	Official Court Reporter United States District Court
21	685 Federal Building 110 Michigan Street, N.W.
22	Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
23	Proceedings reported by stenotype, transcript produced by
24	computer-aided transcription.
25	

```
APPEARANCES:
 1
 2.
     FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
 3
          MR. CLAY M. WEST
          UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
          330 Ionia Avenue, N.W.
 4
          P.O. Box 208
          Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501-0208
 5
          Phone: (616) 456-2404
          Email: Clay.M.West@usdoj.gov
 6
 7
     FOR THE DEFENDANT MUSE MUSE:
          MR. SANFORD ALLEN SCHULMAN
 8
          SCHULMAN & ASSOCIATES, PC
 9
          500 Griswold Street, Suite 2340
          Detroit, Michigan 48226
10
          Phone: (313) 963-4740
          Email: saschulman@comcast.net
11
12
     FOR THE DEFENDANT MOHAMED SALAT HAJI:
13
          MS. MARY CHARTIER-MITTENDORF
          CHARTIER & NYAMFUKUDZA, PLC
          2295 Sower Boulevard
14
          Okemos, Michigan 48864
          Phone: (517) 885-3305
15
          Email: mary@cndefenders.com
16
     FOR THE DEFENDANT MOHAMUD MUSE:
17
          MR. JAMES K. CHAMPION
18
          Law OFFICES OF JAMES K. CHAMPION, PLLC
19
          312 East Fulton
          Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
          Phone: (616) 233-3287
20
          Email: champioj@hotmail.com
21
22
23
24
25
```

Grand Rapids, Michigan 1 December 10, 2019 2 2:03 p.m. 3 PROCEEDINGS 4 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be seated. 5 We're here for basically a status conference 6 7 in the case of the United States of America against Muse Muse, Mohamed Haji, and Mohamud Muse, docket number 1:19-cr-25. 8 9 Can I have the appearance of counsel, please. 10 MR. WEST: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Clay West for the United States. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 MR. WEST: With me at counsel table is FBI 13 Special Agent Paul Dunham, the case agent. 14 15 THE COURT: Thank you. Talk into the microphone. Just remain seated, and 16 then I can hear better. 17 18 Okay. Next? Mr. Champion. 19 MR. CHAMPION: James Champion on behalf of the Defendant Mohamud Muse, Your Honor. 20 21 THE COURT: Thank you. MS. CHARTIER: Good afternoon, Mary Chartier on 22 23 behalf of Mohamed Haji who is seated to my right. MR. SCHULMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor, 24 Sanford Schulman appearing on behalf of Muse Muse seated to my 25

left. His family is also here. 1 Thank you. I'm glad you made it. 2 THE COURT: Okay. Basically this is a status conference, but I 3 want to address a number of things and tell you where I am on 4 it. 5 First of all, I want to keep the case moving, and the 6 most important thing that's happened recently from my 7 perspective is that the government gave me a memo, which I have 8 just perused a couple of days ago, with its position regarding 9 10 confidentiality of information under the statute, Classified Information Procedures Act. So that's where I am. 11 I intend to address their motion fairly promptly, 12 13 keeping in mind the motion that was recently filed by the defendants, an ex parte response setting forth nature and basis 14 of defense, which will be helpful to me probably in analyzing 15 16 the government's positions. Tell me where I might be going wrong here, Mr. West, 17 18

if you would, and then I'll ask the other people too.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I agree with that assessment, Your Honor, and I think resolution of that motion will allow us to perhaps at a future status conference set a trial date in the matter and motions deadlines.

THE COURT: All right. How much -- well, I'll have to figure it out myself, I guess, how much time it's going to take me to look at this material. So maybe I should just leave it where we are right there.

I have the motion, like I said, of the defendants, the ex parte response. That seems to give me a framework or at least an argument to consider when I go through the government's presentations.

I have no comments on the merits of it at this point in time because I haven't been able to look at the government's material. And it says "Critical discovery" -- this is the motion -- "Critical discovery has been withheld from counsel." That's more about the case than I know. So I don't know how they got that information, that critical discovery is being withheld, but anyway, there we are on that.

Any response to any of my -- and now is the time to talk. That's why I wanted you here. Just a minute. Okay. Go ahead.

MR. SCHULMAN: Judge, we did not file -- we did not join in that motion, so when you say "defendants," it's not Muse Muse.

THE COURT: Right. No. The defendants -- there were -- Mr. Haji and Mohamud Muse filed the motion. I know you didn't file the motion. Right.

Okay. Where am I going wrong here? Mr. West, I'll give you the first . . .

MR. WEST: And, Your Honor, when you say critical discovery being withheld, are you referencing the title? And,

```
again, I don't want to dig into the defense filing, ex parte
 1
     filing, but I just didn't recognize that.
 2
                THE COURT: Well, it just says ex parte response.
 3
                                                                   Ιt
     doesn't say it's confidential.
 4
               MS. CHARTIER: Well, it was filed ex parte because it
 5
     does outline our defense.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: Right.
 8
               MS. CHARTIER: So it is --
 9
               THE COURT: That's the way I took it.
10
               MS. CHARTIER: Okay. It is -- right -- I mean --
                THE COURT: But it wasn't being hidden like you say
11
     the government is hiding things. Did you intend that? Because
12
13
     if you did, it doesn't say so.
               MS. CHARTIER: No, we didn't say that they were
14
     hiding things. We said they were withholding things from us.
15
16
     I think they have been very aboveboard about the fact that they
     are not revealing certain documents, and we're saying --
17
     Mr. Champion and I are saying we need those documents.
18
19
                THE COURT: All right.
               MR. WEST: And, Your Honor, just to that point, I
20
21
     will represent that outside of the classified arena all
     discovery the government has has been produced to date.
22
     then obviously our motion concedes that there is material in
23
     the classified arena, and that's the subject of the motion that
24
25
     is pending before the Court right now.
```

with defense counsel -- how far are you in going through the material the government has given to you? For example, on an earlier hearing that we had on this case Mr. Champion said he couldn't understand a lot of the material that was on tape.

And I don't know how many hours or minutes that you're looking at. Where are you on that? Have you gone through, Counsel, everything that the government has given you thus far?

Mr. Champion.

MR. CHAMPION: I wouldn't say everything, Your Honor. Every time I think I'm seeing light at end of the tunnel I see where there's more information, different electronic files. We have two terabyte hard drive disks I'm trying to get through and it's a lot.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Chartier?

MS. CHARTIER: We're well on our way. I would say if we're not done, we're extremely close to being done, but -- and the reason I say that is there's some Blu-ray disks which I discussed with Mr. West this morning. So that's probably the biggest thing that we still need to review. But for us it's the classified documents that are really the big unknown for us.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Schulman.

MR. SCHULMAN: Your Honor, we've completed discovery. We're asking for a trial date be set.

To the classified information, we don't object to the 1 in camera review --2 THE COURT: Just would you sit down and speak into 3 the microphone, please. 4 MR. SCHULMAN: We don't object to the in camera 5 review, but I came onboard late and we reviewed the discovery, 6 7 and we're ready for trial. THE COURT: I'm sorry, sir, I can't understand you. 8 MR. SCHULMAN: We have reviewed the discovery and we 9 10 are ready for trial. THE COURT: Okay. Okay. So -- yeah. So my goal is 11 to keep the case moving and get a firm trial date if we can, 12 13 and then I'll make some rulings regarding the Speedy Trial Act, which is, I think, for all district judges now in the back of 14 15 your head. Maybe I say "our head." But anyway. 16 When do you think the case will be ready for the government? 17 MR. WEST: Your Honor, I think a good part of that 18 19 just depends upon -- you know, without delving into the government's ex parte motion, I think that, you know, if the 20 21 Court proceeds down that road and at least approves the remedy that the government has requested, there will be some 22 additional discovery. So I think really the answer would be 23 upon the Court's ruling on that motion the government gets that 24

discovery to the defense and then the defense should have an

25

assessment at that point of needed time to review and then file whatever motions pretrial beyond that point.

Certainly in the government's perspective it can be ready for trial by, you know, March or April, probably April.

But, again, I think the key factor there will be, you know, the defense ability to review the added material produced in discovery from the pending motion.

and -- the Speedy Trial Act statute, and I -- well, maybe I just ought to say, I would like to get the case tried by, you know, sometime in April anyway. At the same time I don't want to deprive anybody of a fair and adequate defense. So maybe we'll have to keep in touch with meetings like this.

Just let me check my notes. I went through all of this stuff this morning.

MR. WEST: And, Your Honor, I think that's at least from the government perspective a reasonable timeline, but, again, I will defer to defense position once they, you know, have an opportunity to review any additional discovery produced from that -- from the ex parte process.

THE COURT: Yeah, and I don't really know what we're talking about, how much we're talking about. And that's probably good right now. But I'm not going to try to guess at it.

Anybody -- it sounds to me, then, like the defendants

```
are still preparing. In other words, if I look at the Speedy
 1
     Trial Act, I see a lot of exceptions to the 70-day rule here.
 2
               MS. CHARTIER: If I may, Your Honor?
 3
               THE COURT: Go ahead.
 4
               MS. CHARTIER: Mr. West and I had spoken earlier
 5
     today, and I think just pretty similar to what he said, I would
 6
 7
     suggest, if I may, that once the Court makes its decision on
     the classified material, I think that, for at least me, will
 8
     drive how much time, if any, I need.
 9
10
               So, for example, maybe we need an extra week to
     review it, maybe we need a month to review it. I don't know.
11
     And I don't see how anyone can say that they do know because we
12
     don't know what the Court's decision is going to be.
13
                THE COURT: And the Court doesn't have a clue, right.
14
               MS. CHARTIER: Right. And we don't know the volume
15
16
           So for me I think whether April is reasonable, it
     certainly may be, but I think the first step in speaking with
17
     Mr. West was once the Court reaches its decision, then we
18
19
     assess if there are additional materials for us to review, and
20
     then maybe we have a status conference where we're able to say,
21
     okay, we think we need a week, or a month, or whatever it may
     be.
22
23
                THE COURT: Mr. Champion, do you want to add or
     subtract from anything she said?
24
25
               MR. CHAMPION: No, thank you, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Mr. Schulman, anything?

MR. SCHULMAN: Well, I would think the government would know the volume of the material and they can give us an estimate. I mean, there's been other cases similar to this. I mean, to not set a trial date is not our preference at this point. This case has been pending since sometime in -- you know, no trial date just means we can't even tell the destination in terms of preparation and a deadline. I mean, we can always move the trial date, I suppose, but we're asking for a trial date, a firm trial date.

THE COURT: Well, the first time you were here I remember you saying we'll try this case in eight weeks or something like that, and here we are.

MS. CHARTIER: The problem, if I may, with a firm
trial date is then everyone gets witnesses ready for that
date --

THE COURT: I know. I know.

MS. CHARTIER: -- and then when it gets moved, that's a -- I mean, the problem with that fluid date is it really doesn't help with preparation. At least not on the defense side.

THE COURT: All right. Well, regarding the Speedy
Trial Act, I think we're exempt from the 70 days, whatever it
is, pursuant to 18 United States Code § 3161(h)(7) regarding
ends of justice continuance for one thing. Following the

statute would make the proceeding impossible and result in a miscarriage of justice if we jumped in without having the opportunity for the defendants and the government to see their facts and for me to rule on the government's request to keep this material in confidence.

The case is complex due to the nature of the prosecution, which among other things requires the Court to get involved from the perspective of the defendant to review material pursuant to the Classified Information Procedures Act. More time is needed for effective preparation. If I'm repeating myself a bit, I just received the material from the government earlier in the case, and counsel will need more time even after I complete my review of it. And that's good enough for right now. So you can put that in the ends of justice and the additional reasons that I gave.

Anything further at this point in time?

MR. WEST: Your Honor, the government perspective would just be that if the Court is able to rule on the ex parte motions and defense responds either in December or January, then we can have discovery provided through that process and then a new status conference perhaps late January or early February where defense could basically assess what they have and then at that point should be able to give the Court a timeline for when they will be ready for trial and motions, et cetera.

THE COURT: Well, I can see doing it in January. 1 can't see doing it -- getting everything done in December. 2 MR. WEST: Absolutely. And I'm not trying to rush 3 the Court. I just threw out some various timelines. 4 THE COURT: That's all right, Mr. West. Relax. 5 Let me ask this: I would have some questions, I 6 7 think, of you. I assume it's appropriate when you came to my chambers to discuss this. Or that you would come to my 8 chambers to discuss this. I didn't see any real procedure laid 9 10 I might write an article for district judges sometime what to do when you get one of these things. Or do I just make 11 all these decisions on paper? Because, you know, questions 12 13 like Ms. Chartier put in her brief and Mr. Champion put in the brief, you know, just sort of jump out at you. 14 MR. WEST: Yes, Your Honor, and I believe the way it 15 works is that Ms. Guerrero-Randall is the classified 16 information security officer in the case, and my understanding 17 is that at the ex parte hearing she would be present and she 18 19 would audio record so there will be a record of the ex parte --20 THE COURT: Are you -- when I say, well, "Hey," you know, "Mr. West, what about this?" can I do that and have you 21 respond? 22 23 I believe so, Your Honor. But if it's not MR. WEST: within the framework of something that I have -- if it's a 24 25 logistics question and Ms. Guerrero-Randall is present, I

believe she can handle that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, you know, let's just take a hypothetical here. I give to you all the arguments

Ms. Chartier gave to me. What about that? I mean, you know, this is all an entrapment and all these facts take a look at.

Wouldn't that be something you might want to respond to? I don't know. I don't even know if you're entitled to respond to it, frankly. This is the first one I've had. Maybe I ought to ask Mr. Schulman over there.

MR. WEST: And, Your Honor, if the Court would like, I can certainly inquire about a National Security Division attorney being present as well, which may facilitate the process as well.

THE COURT: Okay. Is that a situation that the government faces from time to time in these cases?

MR. WEST: I think at times the DOJ National Security Division can appear at the CIPA 4 hearings. If the Court would like someone who is -- and I'll be frank with the Court, I'm not aware of a CIPA motion in this district at all -- but to the degree that it would facilitate the process to have someone from Washington who deals with these regularly, that's certainly something that I can arrange, and that may simplify or at least facilitate the Court with certain questions.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Schulman, have you been through this before? If you have, tell us what happens.

MR. SCHULMAN: As I recall, the lawyers got clearance. We had to go through clearance for the materials to be reviewed. And we had a protective order for the situation. It's no different than a drug case where you get exposed information that could be detrimental if released. It's the same type of trust. And that's how we handled it is my recollection. The discussion about in chambers and having the Court review it, in the end we had to get our own security clearance so we could review the materials.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WEST: If I may, Your Honor, the government position is that clearances are not necessary in the case because the remedy that we propose is to simply declassify and provide certain materials to defense. So in that regard defense clearances are unnecessary. And there is --

THE COURT: That proves I didn't read the thing, then, doesn't it?

MR. WEST: Well, I'm happy to have ready a brief on that front as well. Or at least an oral brief of the case law on that front as well, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. CHARTIER: And, Your Honor, if the Court wants additional briefing, we can. And I obviously am speaking off the top of my head, but I don't believe it is appropriate for the government to essentially be in an exparte proceeding with

the Court and the Court discusses our defense, meaning
Mr. Champion's and mine, for our clients, and then they get the
chance to say, "Oh, well, here is why they don't need that." I
mean, that, I think -
THE COURT: Well, we know your defense. I mean, you

just put that out in writing in detail.

MS. CHARTIER: Well, we actually -- no, that -- we put the defense earlier on entrapment, but the ex parte pleading goes into more depth about why we need the material. And I don't think it's any surprise what the defense will be, but the point is I don't think the government can sit in an ex parte proceeding with the Court and then, you know, essentially shoot down our defense. And that doesn't give us the opportunity to then rebut what they are claiming.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WEST: Your Honor, I think the Asgari case cited earlier is very clear on that point. But, again, I do agree with the defense that I shouldn't just sit down and read their brief, for example. I think the Court can simply incorporate it into any questions it has as it reviews the motion.

THE COURT: Well, you say any questions that I have. Who would I put these questions to if I had them? That was really my question.

MR. WEST: Well, the government has a motion,

Your Honor, and the Court can certainly have any questions for

the government counsel, which will be primarily myself, I 1 suspect Mr. O'Connor, and perhaps a DOJ attorney as well. 2 3 THE COURT: Okay. Anything further from anyone? MS. CHARTIER: No. Thank you, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Okay. I know it was a long trip for you, 5 Mr. Schulman, and I apologize for that, for this, you know, for 6 7 the shortness. But it wasn't what I think you had anticipated based on my conversation with the other judge. So I appreciate 8 your being here. All right. We're adjourned. 9 Thank you. 10 (Proceeding adjourned at 2:24 p.m.) 11 12 CERTIFICATE 13 I certify that the foregoing is a transcript from the Liberty Court Recording System digital recording of the 14 proceedings in the above-entitled matter, transcribed to the 15 best of my ability. 16 17 December 12, 2019 18 19 20 /s/ Glenda Trexler Glenda Trexler, CSR-1436 21 22 23 24 25